

**CSIPM WRITTEN INPUTS ON PRELIMINARY PROPOSALS
FOR THE CFS 2024-2027 MYPoW
20 March 2023**

With the agreement of the CFS Secretariat the Civil Society and Indigenous Peoples Mechanism (CSIPM) has opted to present its contributions in a more extended and analytical way with a view to strengthening the proposals that will constitute the new MYPoW 2024-2027. As a general comment, we would like to emphasize the need to ensure continuity throughout CFS' work. As such, the next MYPoW has to articulate with the discussions that have emerged over the past 3 years, pointing out the need for an urgent transformation of food systems in order to respond to the current crisis, but also prevent future ones. The work that will be carried out through the substantive sessions of the CFS Bureau and Advisory Group meetings ought to provide important outputs to inform the decision making at CFS 51. Moreover, it is important to guarantee that the workstreams and activities that will be agreed for the next MYPoW receive the financial resources so as to ensure adequate, participatory and meaningful processes, particularly if the CFS does decide to leverage its convening power to respond to the food crisis.

In view of the HLPE report on "Strengthening urban and peri-urban food systems to achieve food security and nutrition in the context of urbanization and rural transformation", which will open the next MYPoW, we would like to remark that it is essential to ensure social protection and the development of strategies to improve the quality of public policies and services to address urban food insecure groups, taking into account their specificities. Adopting a systemic approach that takes into account, for example, the social and solidarity economy can contribute to the realisation of rights and socio-economic inclusion.

The CSIPM believes that some of the current proposals can be adjusted and merged, but in the convergence process, it is essential not to lose the driving ideals of the different proposals, with a special attention to the most affected countries and constituencies. It is important to collaborate so that the future plan of work has internal cohesion and the capacity to speak to the collective desire that the CFS make the most effective contribution possible to addressing the profound food/related challenges the world faces today.

The following comments are organized according to the Strategic Objectives of the CFS. We also recognize, however, the merits of clustering them according to topic. During the first OEWG several MSs underlined their dominant interest in the topics their preliminary proposals addressed and their relative flexibility regarding the modality, SO1 or SO2. Our comments, therefore, also take into account these potential synergies across Strategic Objectives. Finally, under each SO we first indicate some orientation towards clustering, and then also point out some sensitive elements, which we suggest should be revised or even eliminated from the final MYPoW proposals.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1: *Platform: Leverage the convening power as the foremost inclusive international and intergovernmental platform to discuss the FSN situation and coordinate collective action at all levels)*

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 3: *Uptake: Foster the uptake, follow-up and review, and sharing of experiences and best practices on the use and application of CFS products at all levels.*

Proposal #8 (CSIPM, Mexico, Germany): *Strengthening the CFS as a platform for coordination in addressing food crises*

The CSIPM has submitted this proposal, with the support of Mexico and Germany, on the premise that it is essential that the CFS – reformed in 2009 in response to a dramatic food crisis – be able to react rapidly, effectively and proactively to ongoing and emerging crises that risk further aggravating the situation of increasing millions of vulnerable of our world. If the CFS is not able to fulfill this mandate, as the most inclusive intergovernmental forum addressing food issues, what purpose does it serve?

We would like to underline that this proposal for the coming MYPoW does NOT foresee the establishment of any new instrument such as an OEWG or a long and protracted policy convergence process. It simply aims at enabling the CFS to make better use of its potential as a Platform for discussion and coordination in addressing and preventing food crises, as underlined by Strategic Objective 1. Addressing and preventing food crisis are at the core of the CFS mandate, but the platform as such has not yet been utilized effectively for a commensurate response to the ongoing crisis.

The proposal, therefore, aims to strengthen the platform by enabling it to act as a space for sharing experiences and data -both qualitative and quantitative and considering diverse knowledge systems- among MSs and CFS participants as well as information regarding international initiatives taken to address food crisis. It will also contribute to Strategic Objective 3, fostering the uptake of CFS outcomes at all levels.

In practice, the suggestion is that during the next MYPoW, quarterly meetings are held to take stock of the evolving food and nutrition security situation and discuss key thematic issues relevant to food crises and food system transformation on which enhanced policy coordination is needed, giving particular attention to the voices of most affected countries and constituencies and the uniquely diversified forms of evidence on which the CFS can call, including through the evidence provided by the HLPE. Suggestions for thematic issues have been put forward in the CSIPM written submission.

As an input for this activity, the HLPE could be asked to collate existing relevant CFS policy outcomes within a reasoned, human rights-based framework presenting the causes of and the challenges engendered by food crises and recall existing policy guidance to address these challenges as already available in CFS policy outcomes. A compendium of this kind would break down silos between different CFS policy outcomes and make them available as a holistic, action-oriented tool box, increasing their pertinence for MSs and other actors facing crises on the ground and hence making an effective contribution to enhanced uptake. The framework and compendium could help to identify gaps in existing policy guidance. It should be broad enough to accommodate progressively topics currently under discussion in the CFS and those that will be treated during the next MYPoW. It should

also invite relevant contributions from HR-based UN agencies such as WHO, ILO, the HRC and CEDAW and so promote synergies within the UN family.

The collation of policy tools by the HLPE, the mapping of different initiatives that are responding to the food crisis, and the discussions held in these dedicated meetings, giving a special focus to the evidence brought by the countries most affected by the crises, would allow the CFS to bring different tools together, which can be then used by MSs, but also other important actors such as regional and sub/regional intergovernmental bodies, local and territorial authorities, municipalities and so on. This inclusive use of the CFS platform function would also make it possible to detect and address potentially alarming evolutions in good time. Appropriate communication tools, including a dedicated web space would ensure that the results emerging from the CFS coordination efforts through this use of the platform function of the CFS would be readily available to those who need it most.

In response to the food crisis of 2008, the CFS underwent a significant reform, acknowledging that the voices of those most affected by hunger and malnutrition should be prioritized in addressing such crises. Unfortunately, the CFS lagged behind in putting such principles into practice when the COVID/19 pandemic broke out. This proposal by the CSIPM aims at repositioning the CFS as the foremost inclusive intergovernmental platform to elaborate holistic approaches to address present and future crises, with democratically determined public policy leading the way.

FEEDBACK FROM CSIPM ON PROPOSALS WHICH GO IN A SIMILAR DIRECTION AS PROPOSAL #8

Overall, we would firstly remark that similarities with different proposals have been found, although they haven't been specified as belonging to Strategic Objective 1 or 3. We have noted those similarities across the different Strategic Objectives in the following 2 sections (comments on proposals 25, 27, 15 and 36) but through the lens of the proposal #8 to see how these different proposals could dialogue given parallels found in terms of content.

PROPOSED CLUSTERING: Proposals 8, 25 and 27

Proposal #25 (France): *Coordinating Policy Responses to the Global Food Security Crisis*

This proposal is very close to the CSIPM Proposal #8, and the rationale and description also aim to support Strategic Objective 1. If the proponent is willing to drop the proposal of having a dedicated workstream, a convergence into proposal #8 would be easy to find. Our rationale of not having a dedicated policy convergence process is that of not overloading the platform with negotiated processes, which often end up leaving a reduced space for meaningful debate and collective decision-making. This concern seems to be shared by several CFS Member States.

Proposal #27 (SR on RtF, Dominican Republic): *Enhancing CFS coordination role for a global response to the food crisis*

As the CFS Secretariat has rightly suggested, proposals 25 and 27 could find convergence among themselves but also with proposal #8. The CFS would then have on its table a proposal with the full support of Germany, Mexico, France, Dominican Republic, the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food and the CSIPM. Concretely on proposal #27, we agree with the analysis made and also agree on the

need for a “coordinated policy”, although we see as proposal #8 not unrelated to it. The convening power of the CFS should have as ultimate goal guidance for collaborative policy and coordinated action.

.....

Proposal #15 (United Cities and Local Governments, Mauritania, Morocco, FAO Global Taskforce of Local and Regional Governments): *Policy recommendations on promoting local and regional government engagement and sustainable and inclusive food systems*

This proposal also refers to its contribution to Strategic Objectives 1 and 3. This proposal relates to proposal #8 in terms of strategic objectives, but also on the need to bring essential actors together in debates on key issues. In fact, local and regional governments can be crucial for the activities proposed in proposal #8 as they would contribute from different perspective on barriers and challenges faced for the transformation of food systems.

Proposal #36 (France, Kenya, Chile, Switzerland, Philippines, Mexico, The Netherlands, Dominican Republic, Canada, New Zealand, Germany): *In-depth debate on enhanced efforts to increase global awareness and use of CFS Policy Products*

We agree on the flexible approach of this proposal, in the sense that debates on how to uptake CFS Policy Outputs has always been encouraged by the CSIPM. We would like to note that the CSIPM in past experiences has been one of the most active mechanisms in promoting the uptake, implementation and monitoring of CFS outcomes at regional and national levels. The support of the RBAs to the implementation phase needs to be emphasized as well. Good examples of CSIPM’s crucial role in the CFS outcomes uptake are the Right to Food Guidelines, the VGGTs and the Policy Recommendations on Connecting Smallholders to Markets.

New debates and exchanges are truly needed about how to better implement existing CFS instruments. We believe that these exchanges can be integrated in a broader proposal on strengthening the role of the CFS as a coordination platform.

.....

Proposal #5 (Brazil, Argentina, Cabo Verde, Chile, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Germany, Mexico, Panama, Colombia, Cuba): *Investing in Family Farming to strengthen Sustainable Food Systems and to achieve Food Security and Nutrition*

As the largest international space of articulation of civil society organizations and social movements working to eradicate food insecurity and malnutrition, the CSIPM believes that we should have a central place in CFS dialogues regarding family farming.

Based on our initial evaluation, the CSIPM sees some positive aspects of this proposal. The CSIPM has historically been one of the most vocal and persistent advocates in the CFS to defend the rights, needs, and aspirations of family farmers and peasants; therefore, we would very much agree that the CFS

devote significant attention toward strengthening family farming and peasant agriculture to achieve a world free from hunger.

We agree that CFS policy debates could be enriched by utilizing frameworks such as the UN Decade on Family Farming.

In addition, we agree that policy debates should particularly focus on protecting the human rights and improving the livelihoods of women, youth, Indigenous Peoples, and other marginalized and vulnerable groups.

We also see potential for the seminars, workshops, and debates proposed for this workstream to open much-needed spaces of dialogue between Member States, the CSIPM, and UN experts about how the CFS can better align its work and products with human rights instruments such as the UN Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas.

.....

Proposal #9: *The role of agriculture in concurrently delivering ecosystem services and food security and nutrition*

We will refrain from commenting on a proposal whose proponent(s) are not clear.

.....

FEEDBACK FROM CSIPM ON PROPOSALS RELATED TO CONFLICTS AND THE FRAGILITY OF FOOD SYSTEMS FOR FINDING CONVERGENCE

As CSIPM we have supported the proposal #3, as it is of utmost importance to address conflicts causing record levels of internally displaced people and undernourished people. However, at this point in time, we do not see an adequate space within the CFS to engage in a policy convergence process with negotiated outcomes on such issue (as proposed by proposal #12). The CFS Framework for Action on Protracted Crisis has already set important recommendations, and the approach taken in proposal #3 would emphasize again the need to implement the recommendations set there. The FFA is anchored in the human rights and humanitarian law framework which is fundamental to these goals and to ensuring accountability and restitution for those affected by crises. The CSIPM has done an extensive work on the monitoring of this CFS outcome¹ and would be central in the Global Thematic Event proposed.

Aspects of proposal #4 should also be considered for the proposal #3 as the FFA recommends not using food as an instrument for political or economic pressure.

¹ <https://www.csm4cfs.org/14260/>

Central to these discussions will be the premise that food should not be used as a weapon nor as a form of collective punishment. Food is a human right, and as such, it should not be denied to any human being.



REFLECTIONS ON SOME PROPOSALS THAT THE CSIPM DOES NOT SUPPORT

Proposal #1 (Spain, Mexico, Dominican Republic, Angola, FAO, World Bank, IFAD): *Agriculture and food systems and food security financing information system – AFSIS*

In the compilation of the proposals for the MYPoW we have seen a marked tendency for a direction towards investment in agriculture and food systems, in an inverted direction where investment might set priorities for policy setting and not the other way around, where public policies are the ones leading the way and investments follow the political priorities set out by democratic government-led processes. We are concerned about these types of proposals as they distance themselves from the notion of public interest, which must be defined democratically putting the needs of the peoples at the centre of decision-making and not the interest of the private sector. In this sense, references to “innovative finance” might deepen this tendency to shift away from the common good and the human rights framework.

Proposal #6 (Spain, Mexico, Dominican Republic, New Zealand, Finland, Norway, UNPFII, FAO PSUI): *Preserving, strengthening and promoting Indigenous Peoples’ food and knowledge systems*

The CSIPM is committed to the well-being of all its constituents and Indigenous Peoples are a critical part of our mechanism.

Understanding the particular situations and challenges that Indigenous Peoples face throughout the globe, we have attempted to engage with other bodies and agencies that work specifically with Indigenous Peoples. We have done this in the hopes that we are collectively aware of any concerns and/or be “on the same page”, to be a unified force, to ensure the policies that are proposed, negotiated and eventually adopted, respect and uphold the rights of Indigenous Peoples, their fair representation and ensure the well-being as it relates to the “Right to Food” and the work at the Committee on the World’s Food Security (CFS).

We believe that the lead in the further development of this proposal should be with Indigenous Peoples’ representatives. To this effect, we believe that representatives of the CSIPM Indigenous Peoples Constituency and the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues should meet and present a revised version of this proposal.

We have some reservations with proposal #6:

1. The term agri-food systems is mentioned three times in the proposal.

This of extreme concern, as we know by our own Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food, Michael Fahkri, that this term does not include Indigenous Peoples and many of our own food producers. On the other hand, Maximo Torero, Economist for FAO, promotes the term agri-food systems and infers that it is all inclusive. As we understand after the conflict with this terminology from the Voluntary Guidelines negotiations on Gender Equity, and Women and Girls Empowerment, by Gabriel Ferrero, we will continue using agriculture and food systems. Hence, seeing the controversial term be used 3 times in this proposal #6 and it being supported by the Chairman of UNPFII and Indigenous Peoples office at FAO, is very concerning.

2. Intellectual Property and Benefit Sharing (WIPO; Nagoya Protocol; ILO Convention 169; UNDRIP, and others as applicable)

We are concerned with there being Data Mining/Extraction without any measures in place and clearly stated in the proposal to secure the interests of Indigenous Peoples, including benefit sharing protections. For way too long, Indigenous Peoples have been used as "subjects of study", and/or for data extraction without any benefit to the Peoples themselves. Considering everything that Indigenous Peoples are currently experiencing, we have great reservations with this form of data extraction. Also, Indigenous Peoples shall be equal participants, along with any other experts they choose, but never as secondary participants in any way, shape or form.

We trust we can formalize our communication and be able to coordinate a meeting as soon as possible so that together we can collaborate for a wholesome proposal that does not leave room for anything that could undermine the rights of Indigenous Peoples.

Proposal #24 (FAO, IFAD): *Collaborative governance for more effective, resilient and inclusive agrifood systems*

In general, we would put a caution mark on proposals that aim to underestimate the role of the CFS, and re-imagine its functioning. The vision and strategic objectives of the CFS clearly make reference to the commitment of MSs and participants to work in a coordinated manner and to coordinate collective action. The references to “coordination” make the CFS a unique and important space for global food governance, and we will not go along proposals to refer to watered-down terminology such as “collaborative governance”.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2: *Policy: Develop voluntary global policy guidance for policy convergence and coherence to achieve food security and improve nutrition and promote the progressive realization of the right to adequate food*

Proposal #13 (CSIPM): *Diverse, equitable and resilient food systems: public reforms and creating enabling conditions*

This proposal builds upon what has been presented by the HLPE note on Critical, Emerging and Enduring Issues, particularly on the first theme “Build resilient and equitable supply chains for food security and nutrition”.

We acknowledged the importance of that theme in recognizing the vulnerability of global food supply chains and their embeddedness in deep inequalities and unsustainable practices. But we felt that the proposal needed to be broadened up to food systems, particularly to recognize the diverse realities that exist in terms of knowledges, practices, distributions, and provisions, while putting a focus on the necessary reforms and what would constitute enabling conditions for these diverse food systems to flourish.

We also built upon already endorsed CFS outcomes such as In the CFS Policy Recommendations on “Promoting Youth Engagement and Employment in Agriculture and Food Systems for Food Security and Nutrition” and in the VGGTs the CFS which recognize the need for redistributive reforms, particularly to incentivize youth engagement in agriculture. Our proposal also builds upon the recognition of the importance of territorial markets highlighted in the CFS Policy Recommendations on “Connecting Smallholders to Markets”.

This proposal is intended to contribute to Strategic Objective 2, by developing voluntary global policy guidance for policy convergence and coherence to promote the progressive realization of the right to adequate food.

In practice we suggest a policy convergence process leading to policy recommendations which will give guidance on how to act upon power asymmetries and the concentration of natural resources in order to incentivize sustainable, resilient and diverse supply chains that do not depend on the stability of a few actors. While these issues have been partly addressed in the context of natural resources and markets, it is important to have a comparative look at the diversity of food production, distribution and consumption, and there is an increasing need for the CFS to give greater guidance on which enabling conditions and reforms are necessary for the resilience of already existing sustainable food systems or the transition towards them. In particular, an in-depth analysis, followed up by recommendations, should be up taken on the following issues:

- Power asymmetries and power concentration in food systems
- Increasing land concentration and landlessness
- Dependencies and fragility of international trade rules and global value chains

As a timeline, we suggest having an HLPE report on this matter by CFS54 (October 2026) so as to start the negotiation process in 2027 and have the endorsement of the policy recommendations by CFS55.

The HLPE could collect evidence on the different strengths and weaknesses of diverse food systems, looking at how some are more adapt at contrasting climate change and restore biodiversity within a human-rights framework. It could provide examples of successful reforms at all levels (local, regional, global) leading to enabling conditions for the sustainability of food systems, both from the perspective of a healthy planet, but also healthy people. With these hints, it could provide recommendations for CFS MS and participants on which aspects and criteria are key to take into account while designing policies for such reforms and enabling conditions.

FEEDBACK FROM CSIPM ON RELATED PROPOSALS TO PROPOSAL #13 FOR FINDING CONVERGENCE

PROPOSED CLUSTERING: Proposals 11², 13, 15, 21, 32, 35

Proposal #11 (Switzerland, Mexico, SR on RtF): *Building resilient and equitable supply chains for Food Security and Nutrition*

Although this proposal might seem similar to proposal #13, it significantly reduces the scope that the CSIPM is presenting through its proposal. The main aspects described in proposal #11, might find some convergence with proposal #13, but in some cases they should be more systemic. For instance, on the question “*What are the costs and benefits of food trade via specialized global supply chains compared with food trade via territorial and local markets, especially with a view to ensuring diversity and resilience in food supply chains*”, we believe that limiting the approach to food trade through territorial markets does not do justice to the richness of networks that co-exist in territorial markets and referring only to trade might be limiting, as other forms of exchange exist in such contexts. Overall, we think that in many cases this proposal should make reference to “food systems” instead of “supply chains”. This is the case for the title and some of the main aspects to be addressed, including the one mentioned above in its latter part (“*ensuring diversity and resilience in food systems*” instead of “*ensuring diversity and resilience in food supply chains*”).

Finally, we would like to note that through the CSIPM’s proposals, our aim is to open the CFS space to discuss systemic challenges and structural barriers that make the current food system prone to vulnerabilities, as these discussions are urgent to prevent future crisis. Proposal #13 in this sense highlights some of the key issues that are impeding the food system transformation, which proposal #11 might not do as it seems to focus on vulnerabilities, seeing them as disconnected or broken pieces that need to be fixed, without looking at the root and structural causes of the problem.

We are willing to find convergence with this proposal if some key issues mentioned in proposal #13 are included and if the scope is broadened to “food systems”.

Proposal #21 (Angola, Brazil, Portugal): *Territorial governance for more effective, resilient and inclusive food systems systems*

The proposal #21 offers a concrete pathway to take into account the different contexts which governments are facing being it at national, regional or global level so as to strengthen territorial food systems governance mechanism, essential for the urgently needed food systems transformation. This proposal could merge well with the CSIPM proposal #13, as the scope of the latter is to look at the enabling conditions needed for such governance mechanism. The CSIPM believes this merging would make sense because the analysis on the diversity and resilience of food systems, proposed in proposal #13, is a necessary precondition to talk about effective governance at the territorial level, as described in proposal #21.

Proposal #35 (Mexico): *Creation of a CFS Open-Ended Working Group for the establishment of a global binding regulatory framework for food systems*

² pending on proponents taking into account the CSIPM considerations on this proposal

We understand this proposal as being coherent with our proposals #8 and #13, as a needed framework to address systemic barriers for food systems transformation and the prevention of future crisis. Such framework would provide an instrument for creating the enabling conditions for more sustainable and healthy food systems. We look forward to finding convergence with this proposal.

.....

Proposal #18 (CSIPM): *Protecting and restoring biodiversity to mitigate and reverse climate change and for the progressive realization of food sovereignty*

Biodiversity loss, including the loss of diversity within crops and animal species, is a major cause loss in soil fertility, desertification, climate disasters. The loss of biodiversity, along with the effects of climate change (as highlighted by the HLPE note on Critical, Enduring, and Emerging Issues, the climate crisis has tremendous impacts on hunger and malnutrition), expose populations at greater risk of pandemics and further exacerbate hunger, food insecurity, and malnutrition.

It is urgent to include a policy Workstream in the CFS agenda to look back at the interconnection between agriculture and climate with a focus on the needed shift to sustainable, local, and diversified food systems to progressively advance towards food sovereignty.

The expected results of the policy workstream would be policy recommendations or guidelines which - taking into account policies and experiences of the past decade - identify initiatives that promote the restoration of agrobiodiversity, with a focus on sustainable production through agroecological approaches. Agroecological methods and approaches have proven to rely less on resource intensive and monocultural production, and to protect and promote the use of diverse seeds and breeds, which are constantly adapted to local conditions. These recommendations should aim to increase biodiversity in food systems and support small-scale agroecological food producers who work to restore and respect ecosystems, prevent biodiversity loss, and promote food sovereignty.

The expected results are also to:

1. raise awareness among policymakers and the public about the importance of conserving and restoring agrobiodiversity for sustainable food systems, to stay on track with the 2030 Agenda objectives, and overall for food sovereignty;
2. and to improve policy coherence and coordination for biodiversity, agriculture and climate change policies across the UN system in order to enhance food security and nutrition.

We suggest to have an HLPE report in 2025, which could collect evidence on how biodiversity loss in the context of climate change severely affects the sustainability and resilience of food systems. It could review examples of public policies that have been directed towards the progressive realization food sovereignty in the context of climate change and biodiversity loss. The HLPE report could be followed by negotiations and recommendations approved in 2026.

FEEDBACK FROM CSIPM ON RELATED PROPOSALS TO PROPOSAL #18 FOR FINDING CONVERGENCE

PROPOSED CLUSTERING: Proposals 18, 22³, 32

Proposal #22 (France, Chile, Germany, Costa Rica): *Achieving SDG2 by 2030 in a context of climate change and biodiversity loss (proposal for an HLPE report)*

Overall, we are in line with this proposal, although we would like to emphasize the importance of agroecology for food sovereignty when referring to the preservation of nature and biodiversity in any given proposal, so as to avoid that the CFS gives recommendations on widespread false solutions, such as “offsets”, “nature-based solutions”, ... There is broad evidence, coming particularly from local communities, on the human, social and environmental impacts of such proposals; they go in detriment of livelihoods of peasants, Indigenous Peoples, small-scale food producers, fisherfolks, women and youth while deepening the concentration of power in the hands of a few actors from the corporate sector.

We strongly suggest that this proposal takes on board the centrality of food sovereignty if it finds its way ahead, this will guarantee the full support of the CSIPM.

Proposal #32 (proponents from institutions within Bolivia): *Topics to analyze and discuss to achieve adequate nutritional food security*

We believe this proposal has important aspects to be considered if a proposal on biodiversity goes ahead, particularly on subsidies, agrochemicals, urban and peri-urban food systems and international policies (promoting internal food production, food reserves, control over speculation,...). This also applies to any proposal on resilient food systems (see comments related to proposal #13).

.....

Proposal #10 (SR on RtF, Dominican Republic): *Addressing infectious diseases and other biological hazard events that challenge food security and nutrition*

Proposal #14 (Mexico, The Netherlands, Dominican Republic, Germany): *Emerging and re-emerging infectious diseases challenging FSN*

On proposals numbers #10 and #14, we would like to note that the CSIPM proposal #18 goes in line with the needed efforts towards the prevention of emerging and re-emerging infectious diseases, as biodiversity protection and local food systems are important barrier against the spread of zoonotic diseases. In this sense, we would favour an approach that puts greater emphasis on the prevention rather than on the response to infectious diseases. It is well evidenced that agroindustrial food systems based on an extractivist model disrupt people’s social and ecological relationships, so this should be one critical aspect to be addressed by any CFS work on infectious diseases. In this sense, we believe that proposal #10 has placed more focus on these aspects and brought forward a more accurate prevention perspective.

³ pending on proponents taking into account the CSIPM considerations on this proposal

.....

Proposal #20 (Switzerland, Dominican Republic, Germany, Canada, SR on RtF): *Revitalizing Climate Policies for Food Security and Nutrition*

Similar comments to what was mentioned for proposal #22, agroecology for food sovereignty should be central to any discussions and work on climate policies if we are to truly find pathways for food systems to mitigate and adapt to climate change.

.....

Proposal #19 (CSIPM): *Recognizing the role and rights of food system workers*

This proposal also builds from the HLPE's note on critical and emerging issues. This workstream could highly contribute toward meeting SDGs 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 10.

We are calling for a Global Thematic Event during CFS 53 to:

- highlight the essential roles that food systems workers play within formal and informal economies around the world,
- build greater momentum toward the development of public policies aimed at realizing and protecting the right to food for all,
- and improve policy coherence by underscoring the indivisibility and interdependency of human rights, with a particular emphasis on how the right to food interconnects with the right to life and the right to work in a safe environment.

We are also proposing a policy convergence process to begin in 2025 and end in 2026 with the endorsement of policy recommendations by CFS54.

After adoption, a monitoring event could occur to assess advancements and shortcomings in policies, programs, and legal frameworks regarding the realization and protection of the rights of food systems workers.

Among other important topics, the HLPE report for this policy workstream would ideally devote significant attention to:

- How the COVID-19 pandemic has impacted workers across food systems;
- The inequalities, violence, and multiple, intersecting forms of discrimination that workers face in agriculture and food systems, particularly on the basis of sex, gender, age, race, ethnicity, caste, citizenship status, and physical ability;

- And the ways in which the CFS could contribute to and learn from existing frameworks and policy action focused on workers' rights and social protection, especially with respect to ILO conventions as well as efforts toward the implementation of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas (UNDROP).

The HLPE note on critical and emerging issues underscored that many food system workers are subject to low wages and precarious, hazardous working conditions, rarely unionized, and often employed under seasonal or informal arrangements.

Young people face particular challenges, notably in terms of exploitative labor arrangements in agricultural production, including child labor, as well as with regard to the rise of "gig economy" work in urban areas.

Human trafficking is also a serious problem that needs greater attention. As the HLPE included in their note, the UN Special Rapporteur on trafficking in persons has stated, "The growth of agribusiness and the power of corporations, combined with the rapid pace of climate change, have further exacerbated risks of trafficking in persons."

Furthermore, the rights of migrant workers, refugees, and internally displaced people should also be priority areas of focus for this proposed workstream.

FEEDBACK FROM CSIPM ON RELATED PROPOSALS TO PROPOSAL #19 FOR FINDING CONVERGENCE

PROPOSED CLUSTERING: Proposals 19, 26, 28

Proposal #26 (Chile, Colombia, Mexico, FAO, IFAD): *Employment in food systems: improving workers well being by bridging the gaps from data to policy.*

Proposal #28 (Brazil, Ecuador, Cabo Verde, Dominican Republic, Cuba): *Recognizing the role and rights of AgriFood Systems' workers to achieve Food Security and Nutrition*

As an overall comment for these proposals, we see this as an important step to re-affirm the HLPE's vital role to inform policy debates in the CFS by providing independent, comprehensive, and evidence-based analysis based on studies elaborated through a scientific, transparent, and inclusive process.

The rights of workers in agriculture and food systems should be a top priority for the CFS, and we agree with the call from some Member States to devote part of the MYPoW toward developing policy recommendations on the rights of workers in food systems.

We would like to emphasize that a convergence is possible among these proposals, if at the heart of a merge stays the intent to protect and fulfill workers' rights. In this sense, we believe that proposal #26 offers interesting expected results if the focus shifts from describing the problem with "fresh data" to allowing those most affected to bring the respective experiences as evidence for this possible workstream. One of the constituencies of the CSIPM is in fact facilitating the participation of agricultural and food workers, and among them the International Union of Food, Agricultural, Hotel, Restaurant, Catering, Tobacco and Allied Workers' Associations (IUF), which should have a central role

in bringing the needed evidence for any policy recommendation. We would also strongly advocate for Member States to utilize the UN Declaration on the Rights of Peasants, the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and ILO Conventions as major sources of guidance for a policy workstream devoted to the rights of workers in agriculture and food systems.

Proposal #28 in this sense, frames the issue from a rights perspective. We would encourage such a framing taking into consideration that references to agrifood systems need to be changed to “agriculture and food systems”.



FINAL REMARKS BY THE CSIPM

The Civil Society and Indigenous Peoples' Mechanism is once again available to contribute to the next steps towards the development of appropriate methodologies to structure and prepare future MYPoW discussions. The methodologies should help to fully reflect and respond in an auspicious way considering the MYPoW's different uses, in particular its political, financial and mobilisation dimension to produce the necessary impacts to guarantee the human right to food.